§ 1274.204

NASA from another source without restriction; the proposal closely resembles a pending competitive acquisition; and the research proposed demonstrates an innovative and unique method, approach, or concept. Organizations submitting unaccepted proposals will be notified in writing.

- (c) Documentation requirements. For proposals selected for award, the technical officer will prepare and furnish to the grant officer the following documentation:
- (1) For a competitively selected proposal, a signed selection statement and technical evaluation based on the evaluation criteria stated in the solicitation.
- (2) For an unsolicited proposal, a justification for acceptance of an unsolicited proposal (JAUP) prepared by the cognizant technical office. The JAUP shall be submitted for the approval of the grant officer after review and concurrence at a level above the technical officer. The evaluator shall consider the following factors, in addition to any others appropriate for the particular proposal:
- (i) Unique and innovative methods, approaches or concepts demonstrated by the proposal.
- (ii) Overall scientific or technical merits of the proposal.
- (iii) The offeror's capabilities, related experience, facilities, techniques, or unique combinations of these which are integral factors for achieving the proposal objectives.
- (iv) The qualifications, capabilities, and experience of the proposed key personnel who are critical in achieving the proposal objectives.
- (v) Current, open solicitations under which the unsolicited proposal could be evaluated.
- (d) Cost evaluation. (1) The grant officer and technical team will determine whether the overall proposed cost of the project is reasonable and that the recipient's contribution is valid, verifiable, and available. Commitments should be obtained and verified to the extent practical from the offeror or members of the consortia that the proposed contributions can and will be made as specified in the proposal or statement of work.

- (i) If the recipient's verified share on a cooperative agreement equals or exceeds 50 percent of the total cost of the agreement and the total value of the agreement is less than \$5 million, the cost evaluation of the offeror's proposal should focus on the overall reasonableness and timing of the proposer's contribution. Cost or pricing data should not be required and information other than cost or pricing data (defined in 48 CFR (FAR) 15.403–3) should not normally be required.
- (ii) If the recipient's share is projected to be less than 50 percent or the total value of the agreement is more than \$5 million, a more in-depth analysis of the proposed costs should be undertaken. Only information other than cost or pricing data should be required. An analysis consistent with 48 CFR (FAR) 15.404–1 through 15.404–2 should be performed.
- (2) As part of the evaluation of the cost proposal, the source of the recipient's contribution should be determined. Each of the cost elements contributed by the recipient and their amounts should be identified. If the contribution will consist at least in part of IR&D, the extent to which the IR&D may be recoverable from Government awards should be established. This will involve using the estimated Government participation rate of the recipient's General and Administrative indirect cost base for the period of the cooperative agreement. An analysis consistent with 48 CFR (FAR) 15.404-1 and 15.404–2 should be performed.
- (e) Consortium. If the cooperative agreement is to be awarded to a consortium, a completed, formally executed Articles of Collaboration is required prior to award.
- (f) Printing, binding, and duplicating. Proposals for effort which involve printing, binding, and duplicating in excess of 25,000 pages are subject to the regulations of the Congressional Joint Committee on Printing. The technical office will refer such proposals to the Installation Central Printing Management Officer (ICPMO) to ensure compliance with NPD 1490.1. The grant officer will be advised in writing of the results of the ICPMO review.